

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 20 2006

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/092,050

Filed: March 5, 2002

Docket No.: 10008068-1

Title: PRINTER OPTION SUGGESTION METHOD AND PROGRAM

REMARKS

The following Remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed October 6, 2006, in which claims 1-20 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1 and 16 have been amended to clarify Applicant's invention. Claims 1-20, therefore, remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Igval US Patent No. 6,045,206.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igval US Patent No. 6,045,206, and further in view of well known prior art.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igval US Patent No. 6,045,206, and further in view of Hopkins US Patent No. 5,390,004.

Claims 16, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igval US Patent No. 6,045,206, and further in view of Overall et al. US Patent No. 5,797,061.

Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igval US Patent No. 6,045,206 and Overall et al. US Patent No. 5,797,061, and further in view of well known prior art.

With this Amendment, independent claims 1 and 16 have each been amended to clarify that the available options for the at least one printing device include "paper handling, consumable, servicing, print processing, configuration, software, and hardware options for said at least one printing device," and clarify that the installed options currently existing on the at least one printing device include "paper handling, consumable, servicing, print processing, configuration, software, and hardware options of said at least one printing device."

With respect to the Igval, Hopkins, and Overall et al. patents, Applicant submits that these patents, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method for improving use of printing devices as claimed in independent claim 1, and do not teach or suggest a method for suggesting printing device options as claimed in independent claim 16.

Best Available Copy

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/092,050

Filed: March 5, 2002

Docket No.: 10008068-1

Title: PRINTER OPTION SUGGESTION METHOD AND PROGRAM

For example, the Igval patent discloses a method of operating an ink jet printer including using a maintenance algorithm to control timing of a maintenance action, keeping a historical log of an operating characteristic of the ink jet printer over a period of time, and changing the maintenance algorithm for subsequent use by the ink jet printer based upon the historical log (see Abstract). The Igval patent, however, does not determine all options available for the printing device, does not determine all installed options currently existing on the printing device, and does not determine a set of optimal options for the printing device based on the usage characteristics, the available options and the installed options, wherein the available options for the printing device include paper handling, consumable, servicing, print processing, configuration, software, and hardware options for the printing device, and the installed options currently existing on the printing device include paper handling, consumable, servicing, print processing, configuration, software, and hardware options of the printing device.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 16 are each patentably distinct from the Igval, Hopkins, and Overall et al. patents and, therefore, are each in a condition for allowance. Furthermore, as dependent claims 2-15 further define patentably distinct claim 1, and dependent claims 17-20 further define patentably distinct claim 16, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are also in a condition for allowance. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and claims 10, 13, 16, 18, 20, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claims 1-20 be allowed.

Best Available Copy

NOV 20 2006

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/092,050

Filed: March 5, 2002

Docket No.: 10008068-1

Title: PRINTER OPTION SUGGESTION METHOD AND PROGRAM**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-20 are all in a condition for allowance and requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Nathan Rieth at Telephone No. (208) 396-5287, Facsimile No. (208) 396-3958 or Scott A. Lund at Telephone No. (612) 573-2006, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Travis J. Parry,

By,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2006
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: Nov. 20, 2006
SAL:hsf
Scott A. Lund
Reg. No. 41,166

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on this 20th day of November, 2006.

By: 
Name: Scott A. Lund